UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/309,372	05/11/1999	KENNETH M. LASSESEN	3797.77742	7410

28319 7590 08/23/2006

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,
ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NOS. 003797 & 013797
1001 G STREET , N.W.
SUITE 1100
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/309,372	LASSESEN, KENNETH M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Maikhanh Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 May 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 05/19/2006 to the original application filed 05/11/1999.

2. Claims 1-14 are currently pending in this application. Claim 14 has been amended. Claims 1, 6, and 14 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Flanagan et al.** (US 6,993,471 – filed 11/1995) in view of **Kennelly et al.** (US 6,559,861, filed 03/09/1999).

As to claim 14:

Flanagan teaches a method *(see fig. 8 and col.5, lines 1-17)* of displaying *(e.g., displays)* at least a portion of a document *(e.g., the translated document)* in a language *(e.g., his native language)* selected *(e.g., selects)* by a user *(e.g., the user 84)*, comprising the steps of:

at a receiving computer *(e.g., user's PC 84)*:

- receiving the electronic file from a sending computer *(e.g., online documents from the World Wide Web/ the Web document retrieved by the browser 88) [see fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16]*;
- allowing a user *(e.g., the user 84)* to select *(e.g., selects)* a language *(e.g., the desired target language)* in which the document is to be displayed *(e.g., then displays) [see fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16]*;
- replacing the plurality of words in the document with the selected plurality of respective translation for the plurality of words *(e.g., HTML document (88) in language X is translated into HTML document (90) in language Y by machine translation system 80) [see fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16]*; and
- displaying the document to the user *(e.g., then displays for the user 84 the translated document 90) [see fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16]*.

Flanagan does not specifically teach "*assigning to a plurality of words in the document a plurality of identifiers, wherein each identifier corresponds to a respective one of a plurality translations contained in the document for the plurality of words; and using an*

identifier from the plurality of identifiers to select a translation from the plurality of translations for the plurality of words."

Kennelly teaches assigning to a plurality of words in the document a plurality of identifiers, wherein each identifier corresponds to a respective one of a plurality translations contained in the document for the plurality of words *(e.g., displays each of the available languages in a drop down menu box 218 of page 208... down menu box 218 of page 208 presents all available languages);* and using an identifier from the plurality of identifiers to select a translation from the plurality of translations for the plurality of words *(e.g., when a user accesses system 10 and selects an Administrator page 208 (FIG. 7), logic within the management object that produces page 208 causes management object request processor 156 (FIG. 4) to traverse language directories 204, 205, 206 and determine which languages are available to the user. Each time the user selects Administrator page 208, management object request processor 156 reads all the subdirectories under root directory 220 and looks for the existence of corresponding data files 220en, 220jp, 220fr, e.g., language.txt. The data files 220en, 220jp, 220fr contain information regarding the corresponding languages. When management object request processor 156 locates a language.txt file in a subdirectory, processor 156 presumes that system 10 supports the corresponding language. Subsequently, system 10 displays each of the available languages in a drop down menu box 218 of page 208. (FIG. 7) Drop down menu box 218 presents all available languages in the selected language, e.g., English. Alternatively, drop down menu box 218 may present each available language in*

that language, e.g., drop down menu box 218 could present the English option in the English language and the Japanese option in the Japanese language. The user can select the desired language in box 218, e.g., with a mouse. If the user selects a new language other than the default language (step 302), such as Japanese) [see fig.7 and the discussion beginning at col.7, line 9 and col.9, line 4].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the feature from Kennelly in the system of Flanagan because it would have allowed non-English speaking Internet user to access and understand information available from the World Wide Web and related sources.

As to claim 6:

The rejection of claim 14 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Flanagan teaches an electronic file *(e.g., online documents from the World Wide Web/ the Web document retrieved by the browser 88) [see fig. 8 and col. 5, lines 1-16].*

As to claim 7:

Flanagan teaches the electronic file is an HTML document *(e.g., HTML language X/ HTML language Y; see fig. 8).*

As to claim 8:

Flanagan teaches the translation for said at least one word is stored in a data structure on a server *(e.g., a Web Server; see fig. 8).*

As to claim 9:

Flanagan teaches the data structure is an array *(e.g., see the HTML data structure discussion, beginning at col.4, line 40).*

As to claim 10:

Flanagan teaches a Web browser displays the HTML document to the user *(e.g., The Web browser 82 then displays for the user 84 the translated document 90; col.5, lines 12-15).*

As to claim 11:

Flanagan teaches the translated HTML document is provided to the user via the Internet *(e.g., the World Wide Web; see the Abstract and fig. 8).*

As to claim 12:

Flanagan teaches a plurality of words in the HTML document are assigned a plurality of identifiers *(e.g., French if the user speaks French; col.5, lines 1-16).*

As to claim 13:

Flanagan teaches a plurality of phrases in the HTML document are assigned a plurality of identifiers that correspond to said translation *(e.g., machine translation is integrated into a Web browser... allow the user 84 to rapidly and automatically translate online documents from the World Wide Web 86 into his native language... The user 84 of the multilingual browser 82 selects the desired target language, (e.g. French if the user speaks French), and the Web document retrieved by the browser 88 may be rapidly translated on-the-fly with a mouse click; col.5, lines 1-16).*

As to claim 1:

It is directed to a computer-readable medium for implementing the method of claim 14 above, and is similarly rejected in the same rationale. Additionally, Flanagan teaches "an electronic file *(e.g., online documents from the World Wide Web/ the Web document retrieved by the browser 88) [see fig. 8 and col. 5, lines 1-16].*

Flanagan does not specifically teach "*a first plurality of phrases, wherein each phrase of the first plurality of phrases is expressed in a plurality of languages; and a second plurality of phrases that are expressed in the language selected by the user.*"

Kennelly teaches a first plurality of phrases, wherein each phrase of the first plurality of phrases is expressed in a plurality of languages; and a second plurality of phrases that are expressed in the language selected by the user *(e.g., system 10 displays each of the*

available languages in a drop down menu box 218 of page 208. (FIG. 7) Drop down menu box 218 presents all available languages in the selected language, e.g., English. Alternatively, drop down menu box 218 may present each available language in that language, e.g., drop down menu box 218 could present the English option in the English language and the Japanese option in the Japanese language. The user can select the desired language in box 218, e.g., with a mouse. If the user selects a new language other than the default language (step 302), such as Japanese, system 10 executes HTML script of page 208 and overrides the existing parameters 222) [see fig.7 and the discussion beginning at col.7, line 9 and col.9, line 4].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the feature from Kennelly in the system of Flanagan because it would have allowed non-English speaking Internet user to access and understand information available from the World Wide Web and related sources.

As to claim 2:

Flanagan teaches the electronic file is received at the use's computer via the Internet *(e.g., documents available on the WWW and displayed by browser; col.2, lines 18-61).*

As to claims 3 and 4:

They include the same limitations as in claims 7 and 10, respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 5:

Flanagan teaches the Web browser translates at least a portion of the HTML document into the language selected by the user *(e.g., machine translation is integrated into a Web browser... allow the user 84 to rapidly and automatically translate online documents from the World Wide Web 86 into his native language... the Web document retrieved by the browser 88 may be rapidly translated on-the-fly with a mouse click; col.5, lines 1-16).*

Response to Arguments

5. Applicants' arguments filed 05/19/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

 a. Applicant argues that Flanagan does not teach "the electronic file's content includes a first of phrases, wherein each phrase of the first plurality of phrase is expressed in a plurality of languages and has a meaning that is different than the meanings of other phrases of the first plurality of phrases regardless of the language in which the each phrase is expressed" and " at the user's computer , selecting, for the display to the user, from the first plurality of phrases, a second plurality of phrases that are expressed in the language selected by the user" [Remarks, page 5].

In response, the new reference, Kennelly, is combined with Flanagan to teach "the electronic file's content includes a first of phrases, wherein each phrase of the first plurality of phrase is expressed in a plurality of languages and has a meaning that is different than the meanings of other phrases of the first plurality of phrases regardless of the language in which the each phrase is expressed" and " at the user's computer , selecting, for the display to the user, from the first plurality of phrases, a second plurality of phrases that are expressed in the language selected by the user *(e.g., system 10 displays each of the available languages in a drop down menu box 218 of page 208. (FIG. 7) Drop down menu box 218 presents all available languages in the selected language, e.g., English. Alternatively, drop down menu box 218 may present each available language in that language, e.g., drop down menu box 218 could present the English option in the English language and the Japanese option in the Japanese language. The user can select the desired language in box 218, e.g., with a mouse. If the user selects a new language other than the default language (step 302), such as Japanese, system 10 executes HTML script of page 208 and overrides the existing parameters 222) [see fig.7 and the discussion beginning at col.7, line 9 and col.9, line 4].*

b. Applicant argues that Flanagan does not teach "using an identifier from the plurality of identifiers, wherein the identifier corresponds to the language selected by the user, to obtain, from the respective translations in the electronic file, a translation, in the language selected by the user, for the at least one word, and

inserting the translation obtained from the electronic file into a translated electronic file" [Remarks, page 7].

In response, the new reference, Kennelly, is combined with Flanagan to teach using an identifier from the plurality of identifiers, wherein the identifier corresponds to the language selected by the user, to obtain, from the respective translations in the electronic file, a translation, in the language selected by the user, for the at least one word, and inserting the translation obtained from the electronic file into a translated electronic file *(e.g., when a user accesses system 10 and selects an Administrator page 208 (FIG. 7), logic within the management object that produces page 208 causes management object request processor 156 (FIG. 4) to traverse language directories 204, 205, 206 and determine which languages are available to the user. Each time the user selects Administrator page 208, management object request processor 156 reads all the subdirectories under root directory 220 and looks for the existence of corresponding data files 220en, 220jp, 220fr, e.g., language.txt. The data files 220en, 220jp, 220fr contain information regarding the corresponding languages. When management object request processor 156 locates a language.txt file in a subdirectory, processor 156 presumes that system 10 supports the corresponding language. Subsequently, system 10 displays each of the available languages in a drop down menu box 218 of page 208. (FIG. 7) Drop down menu box 218 presents all available languages in the selected language, e.g., English. Alternatively, drop down menu box 218*

may present each available language in that language, e.g., drop down menu box 218 could present the English option in the English language and the Japanese option in the Japanese language. The user can select the desired language in box 218, e.g., with a mouse. If the user selects a new language other than the default language (step 302), such as Japanese) [see fig.7 and the discussion beginning at col.7, line 9 and col.9, line 4].

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hamann	U.S. Pat. No. 6,092,036	Issued: Jul. 18, 2000
Issaac et al.	U.S. Pat. No. 6,632,248	Issued: Oct. 14, 2003

Contact information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN

H Herndon

Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100